



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME DOUBTFUL CONSTRUCTIONS IN
GERMAN GRAMMAR.

As far as the writer knows, the history of the construction *jemand Fremder* has not yet been written, nor have the exact boundaries of its present use been determined. *Fremder* was probably once felt as a partitive genitive plural, but is now undoubtedly felt as a masculine nominative appositive to *jemand*. Paul in his "Wörterbuch" mentions only the neuter form *jemand Fremdes*. Here *Fremdes* was originally a neuter genitive, but it is now constructed as an appositive to *jemand*. Sanders in his "Hauptschwierigkeiten", p. 190, regards the masculine form as dialectic. Blatz in his "Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik", II, p. 380, regards the masculine form as the regular one except in *jemand anders*, *wer anders*. The writer in his German Grammar, p. 195, on the basis of his own collection of materials also represents the masculine as the common form. In response to a personal inquiry a large number of prominent German scholars have informed the writer that the neuter is the usual form, a few replied that they know both, a few answered that they did not know the construction at all. A number considered the neuter as distinctively S. G. The writer, however, finds the masculine most frequently in the South, but also finds it in every part of the German-speaking territory. As opposed to this twofold appositional construction after *jemand*, *niemand*, indefinite *wer*, the writer finds after interrogative *wer* only the old genitive: *wer anders* (never *anderer*), *wessen anders*, *wem anders* (never *anderem*). Grimm in his "Wörterbuch" under *anders* gives, however, the masculine appositional forms *wem anderem*, *wen anderen*. Andresen in his "Sprachgebrauch", 7th ed., p. 271, doubts the existence of these masculine appositional forms and explains their failure to develop here by the clearness of the case form in the pre-

ceding *wem, wen*. The writer, however, in his "German Grammar", p. 196 (e. Note 1) quotes the form *wer anderer somebody else* used indefinitely, and he has since then found this form several times. Thus the appositional form is employed here altho *wer* clearly marks the case. The writer has not yet found this masculine form after interrogative *wer*, but he is not entirely convinced that it does not exist. He would be grateful for citations from modern authors in case of any of the constructions mentioned above, for these forms are rather infrequent and it may take him many years yet to gather full information here if he must depend upon his own collection of materials.

During the last three years the writer has noted in his reading of modern authors the various genitive forms of names of persons ending in a sibilant. Usage varies considerably here, but there seems to be a marked tendency to indicate the genitive here in print by an apostrophe, as in *Onkel Franz' Befinden*. This form is also the favorite where the genitive follows the governing noun altho this is strictly forbidden by a number of grammarians: *Isolde Kurz, die Tochter Hermann Kurz'* (Bartel's *Deutsche Dichtung*, p. 202). As the result of an extended investigation it appears that this form also prevails in foreign words, altho the writer in his *German Grammar*, p. 102, in harmony with other grammarians represents the endingless form with a preceding definite article as the common one here. In his recent readings the writer has found the form with the apostrophe in foreign nouns in every kind of literary style. *Thoas' letzte Worte* (Hermann Grimm's *Fragmente*, I, p. 98), *der ästhetische Wert der Dichtungen Dickens'* (Paul Hensel's *Thomas Carlyle*, p. 113), *Tacitus' Historien* (Stilgebauer's *Goetz Krafft*, I, p. 206), etc. The ending *-ens* was once widely used, especially in German words, but it is now largely confined to a few short Christian names, as *Hansens, Maxens*, etc. A number of grammarians are still endeavoring to favor and spread this usage, but the tendency toward the form with the apostrophe is not in any perceptible measure weakened.

This has aroused the wrath of Mr. Gustav Wustmann and his followers. They lament the helplessness of the German language which can mark the genitive only by a sign that is visible to the eye, but not audible to the ear. Professor Roedder of the University of Wisconsin has raised the question whether this charge that there is really no audible ending here is true. He believes that many Germans pronounce *sz'* or *s'* with double pressure, thus making a *slight* syllabic division in the middle so that a real double *S* is spoken. In response to a personal inquiry a large number of prominent scholars have informed the writer that they pronounce the *sz'* or *s'* with double pressure. It is to be hoped that this question will be further investigated. If there is really a double *S* it would be well to indicate it clearly placing the apostrophe before it to indicate the ending of the name itself. Mr. K. Erbe in his "Wörterbuch der deutschen Rechtschreibung", p. XVI, goes so far as to recommend it. In examining the literature of the last years the writer finds the usage quite frequently after *sch*, as in *Busch's Erzählung* (Professor Minor), but rarely after *sz*, *s*, or *z*. In one instance the ending *-es* occurs: *Meljanz'es Vater* (Martin's *Wolfram von Eschenbach Parzival*, II, p. XXV). Mr. Wustmann, however, finds a number of cases of the use of *'s* which he cites in his "Allerhand Sprachdummheiten", 3rd ed., p. 9, at the same time severely censuring the usage. It would, however, be a great gain to the language, if the form in *'s* should be regularly employed and find expression in the written language. It was once the rule to write *es* or *s* here: *Arthuses hof* (Wolfram's *Parzival*, 296, 25), *Artuss her* (ib., 326, 5). At one time the *s'* was in large measure lost also in English, but it seems to be the prevailing form to-day. The writer would be grateful for examples of *'s* after *sz*, *s*, *z* in the literary language and begs the readers of the *Journal* to send him such with accurate references. He is anxious to verify Mr. Wustmann's claim that it is used by many.

There is considerable fluctuation in the inflection of names and titles. The writer gives a rather full account of these fluc-

tuations in his German Grammar, pp. 99-108. He desires to view these facts in the light of their historical development. To-day title and name are often regarded as one and inflected accordingly: *das Bronzereiterstandbild Kaiser Friedrichs*. The case-ending is naturally added to the second word, as title and name are here considered as a compound noun. If the article precedes, the compound should be without an ending in accordance with the general rule that the proper name is not now inflected when it is preceded by an article: *die Werke des Professor Schmidt, die Kochstudien des Fräulein Klara*. In direct contrast to this usage the title may be inflected and the following name remain unchanged: *neben der Grabstätte der Gattin Herzogs Konrad des Roten* (Steinhausen's *Geschichte der deutschen, Kultur*, p. 181), *die Schwester Königs Artus* (Martin's *Wolfram*, II, p. 445), *im Hause Meisters Lorenz* (Wilhelm Fischer's *Die Freude am Licht*, p. 181), *der Sohn eines Leibarztes des Königs Ernst August von Hannover* (*Hamburger Nachrichten*, Nov. 16, 1904). The inflection of the first word here, i. e. the title, destroys the idea of the unity of the two nouns. The fluctuation of usage here is great and it is impossible to establish a firm rule. It is, perhaps, true that the title and name are more commonly considered as one when the nouns are not preceded by an article, as in *das Reiterstandbild Kaiser Friedrichs*, but the opposite usage is quite frequent, as in the examples from Steinhausen, Martin and Fischer given above. When the article precedes, it is perhaps more common to inflect the title, but it even here becomes quite natural to consider the two nouns as one and leave them both uninflected when the combination of title and name is so familiar that they are really felt as one, as in *der Tod des Doktor Martin Luther*. This is always true of names of animals or lifeless objects, as in *an Bord des "Prinz Waldemar"* (boat). In case of weak titles of persons this is now rarely true, for the title is quite regularly inflected: *der Sohn des Grafen* (or *Herrn*) *Rechberg*. Formerly, however, non-inflection of the title is also found here. *Mache Er Herr Justen den Kopf nicht*

warm (Lessing's *Minna*, 1, 2). *Vom Graf Stein* (Kleist's *Käthchen*, 3, 6). This double conception is also found in M. H. G. *der junge sun froun* (wk. gen. of *Frau*) *Uoten* (wk. gen. of name) *Nibelungenlied*, 33, *Aventiure*), *künec Artuses hof* (*Gedichte Walters von der Vogelweide*, p. 99, Paul's ed.). Thus this fluctuation is old and tenacious. In general, however, there does not seem to be as lively a feeling for the unity of title and name as formerly.

The writer has treated the use of *haben* and *sein* in compound tenses quite fully in his German Grammar, pp. 289-296. One of the best parts of Wilmanns's "Deutsche Grammatik" is devoted to this subject, and Paul has given it still more extensive consideration in a special treatise. Altho the writer has been studying this question for many years, he has not yet come to rest, for new difficulties are presenting themselves and call for an explanation. In English the whole question with all its subtleties has been definitely settled by simply discarding the use of *to be* here and employing *to have* without regard to the meaning. The writer is disposed to think that this is a distinct loss to the language, one of the greatest losses it has ever sustained. There is, however, still a little feeling left for the meaning of *to be* here and hence there is an occasional impulse or desire to use it: "The melancholy days *are come*" (Bryant). "We have found the nest of the gang, but the birds *are flown*." The real cause that brought about the loss of *to be* was probably the large number of cases where either *to be* or *to have* could be used without a marked difference. There must have been also a large number of cases where *to have* was used in compounds under the influence of the simple verb, altho *to be* would have been more appropriate upon the basis of the meaning. This usage will be illustrated below by examples from the German. Thus the feeling for the real meaning of *to be* was blunted. There was an inclination to the use of *to have* even in Old English which later led to its exclusive use. This inclination toward *haben* can also be seen in the literary North German of our own time as also in earlier periods: Niemals *hat* über

den Marktplatz von Hilligenlei solch wildes Pantoffelgeklapper geschallt (Frenssen's *Hilligenlei*, V). This same inclination is also noticeable in the North with certain verbs of motion where *sein* has now elsewhere become associated with these same verbs, as it was so frequently used with them when a goal was expressed that it became established as the fixed auxiliary without regard to the meaning in the special case: Als wir drei Wochen marschiert *hatten* (Frenssen's *Peter Moors Fahrt nach Südwest*, p. 172). Das tut sie immer, aus Spass, wenn ich so toll gelaufen *habe* (id., *Jörn Uhl*, XIV). So flüsterte der See und die Bäume und der Wind in der Nacht in der Gegend, wo er noch vor vierzehn Tagen gewandelt *hatte* (id., *Hilligenlei*, p. 571). Er wüsste noch, wie er hier so zwischen die Windflügel (wind-sails of a wind-mill) durchgeritten wäre unde die Flügel *hätten* dabei gegangen so schnell wie 'ne Kaffeenmühle (Lauff's *Kärrekiek*, p. 222). In contrast to these North Germans other writers from the North use *sein* here: Drei Tage und Nächte, sagte er, *wäre* der Kaiser geritten (Wildenbruch's *Kaiser Heinrich*, 3, 2). Der ist gerast wie doll (N. G.=toll×Halbe's *Haus Rosenhagen*, p. 94). This confusion in the North is increased by the occasional use of *sein* with such verbs of rest as *beharren*, *verharren*, *beruhen*, *bestehen*, *hangen*, *liegen*, *schweben*, *sitzen*, *stecken*, *stehen*: Jenes Gebiet, das bis dahin in altertümlicher Steinzeit verharret *war* (Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte*, I, p. 47). The writer gives a number of examples in his German Grammar, pp. 291-292, and has recently collected more. These facts are so confusing that it is quite difficult to see the actual situation. There is here a veritable tangle of former and present conditions, of dialectic and literary tendencies. Earlier in the period there seems to have been a distinct tendency in the North toward *haben*. Luther sometimes even used it with *sein*: Darumb *hett* nie kein heylge szo küne gewest (Weim. Ausg. I, 220). Andresen in his "Sprachgebrauch", 7th ed., p. 92, even in our own time recommends *haben* in the following sentence: Dies Kind *hatte* [now more commonly replaced by *war*] in seinem

Leben noch nie gegangen. He also recommends on the same page: Die Uhr *hat* gegangen. The writer has observed this latter expression for years, but has uniformly found only *sein* both in the North and South, as illustrated in his Grammar, p. 295. Thus it seems that the use of *haben* in the North in a number of cases is only the lingering survival of older usage and has in reality a flavor of dialect. This seems especially true in Frenssen who has a strong predilection for *haben*. Only in case of the verbs of rest given above has North German usage fixed itself in the literary language, and even here it is stubbornly opposed in the South, not only by the grammarians, but by the best literary usage. It seems very inconsistent for Luther to use *haben* to form the compound tenses of *sein*, while he employs *sein* to conjugate *liegen*, *sitzen*, and often *stecken*, *stehen*. The use of *sein* is occasionally found even in recent N. G. writers. The explanation for this peculiar phenomenon seems to be that the older use of *sein* here has not yet been entirely supplanted in the North by dialectic *haben*. In general this dialectic *haben* has in N. G. worked its way into the little group of verbs of rest given above, but with the verbs of rest *sein* and *bleiben* and in all other groups of intransitives South German usage has gained the victory and has become fixed in the literary language. We can, however, speak of a fixedness of usage only in a general sense. There is still considerable fluctuation, and indications that the development has not yet reached a final conclusion are everywhere to be found. The most common source of these fluctuations is the use of the same verb in different meanings, hence with *haben* in one meaning and *sein* in another: Der Schiffer *hat* (to denote an act) or *ist* (to denote a change of place, the beginning of the voyage) abgestossen. Er *hat* (to denote an act) or *ist* (to denote the end of an act and the resulting change of place) gerückt. In present usage there is a keen feeling for such differences. *Haben* denotes an act as continuing or as a whole, while *sein* indicates only a single point, either the final point or the start or beginning. *Haben* is used even tho the action lasts only

a second. In this case, however, the action must be represented as a whole, in its entire duration even tho it be but a flash and the attention must not be directed to the beginning or the end the result: Er *hat* nicht gezuckt. Altho the feeling for this distinction between *haben* und *sein* is in general quite strong, there are three categories in which this feeling has become unsettled. The first one is the group of verbs of motion which may sometimes be used in connection with a goal and sometimes without a goal. As such verbs are more commonly used with a goal, *sein* is in present usage becoming associated with them even where an act as a whole in its entire duration is clearly represented and not the slightest reference to a goal is in any way implied: Das war doch nett, hier ganz unerwartet einen alten Bekannten aus der Heimat als Kameraden zu treffen, den Junghans, der aus einer der Fischerhütten daheim am Flussufer stammte, mit dem er im Sommer geschwommen *war* und manchmal auch verbotenerweise Gründlinge gelangt hatte (Beyerlein's *Jena oder Sedan?*, I). This is such a common misuse of *sein* that it must be regarded as fairly established. Only a few North Germans employ *haben* here and even these do so only occasionally. Evidently there is here a strong trend toward *sein* which may in time blunt the feeling for the true distinction between *haben* and *sein*. Some may possibly reject the example from Beyerlein, but there are so many examples where the proper use of *haben* would to-day be felt by *every* German as incorrect that it must be admitted that the language has at this point met with a real loss which at present seems irreparable.

The second category where *sein* is creeping in is the group of compounds where the simple verb influences the construction and leads to the use of *sein* altho the thought demands *haben*: "Wir *sind* wohl alle nicht so ganz vollkommen ehrlich und aufrichtig gegen sie verfahren, wie wir nach strengen Sittenlehren eigentlich sollten" (H. Hoffmann). On the other hand, the force of the simple verb often leads to the use of *haben* where we should expect *sein* on the basis of meaning: "Ich *habe* auf

eine Minute bei ihm vorgesprochen" (M. Heyne's *Wörterbuch*, III, p. 1309). To add to the confusion here the feeling for the real meaning often asserts itself and leads to the employment of *sein* here: "Er wurde dazu noch durch eine merkwürdige Mitteilung der Frau Rechnungsrat gedrängt, dass zwei Tage vorher in der Dämmerung eine verschleierte Dame bei ihr vorgesprochen *sei*" (Kretzer's *Die Madonna von Grunewald*, p. 347). On account of the use of either *sein* or *haben* in such instances according as the force of the simple verb or its meaning is felt we are often uncertain as to the intention of the author: "Ich fügte hinzu, dass ich ausser Jodeln keinerlei Künste verstehe, doch habe mir sein Klavierspiel oft schön und verlockend heraufgeklungen" (Hermann Hesse's *Peter Camenzind*, p. 64). Why is *haben* used in this sentence? Is it because the simple verb is conjugated with *haben*, or is it because the author desired to bring out the durative idea? If this latter construction is the correct one, the thought is beautifully expressed indeed. *Sein* could also be used here, but it would express only the idea of a goal, as in the following sentence: "Eine Hornfanfare *war* längst durch die frische Herbstluft aus der Gegend des Schlosses herübergeklungen" (Schücking's *Gs. Erz.*, 4, 239). In these cases where *haben* or *sein* is employed according as the force of the simple verb or as the meaning of the verb is felt the South German is as likely to choose the one as the other and does not seem to be influenced here by his general inclination toward *sein*: "Alle ihre derartigen Versuche *haben* aber bis jetzt fehlgeschlagen" (Neue Züricher Zeitung, 16. Feb. 1904), but Hermann Wunderlich has preferred to say here: "Auch die Versuche, selbst die lateinischen Termini zu verdeutschen, *sind* immer wieder fehlgeschlagen."

The third category where *sein* is creeping in is figurative usage. Here the meaning often requires *haben* as the reference is to an act, but *sein* is often used as the original local force of the verbal construction is felt. Thus we usually say: *Ich habe in ihn gedrungen*, but we also find *sein* here: (*Sie sagte*) *Das seien nutzlose Beunruhigungen, weshalb sie denn auch in*

ihn gedrungen sei, von solchen Berechnungen Abstand zu nehmen (Fontane's *Saecklin*, p. 107).

In general the use of *sein* has been extended at the expense of *haben*. In English the opposite development has taken place, but to a much greater degree of completeness. It is not at all probable that the spread of *sein* will go much beyond its present limits. There is at present considerable fluctuation here, and to judge by the uncertain usage at this point thruout many centuries this will long continue, but a careful study of the growth and development of this construction clearly shows that it is a permanent feature of German Grammar and indeed well adapted to the expression of German thought and feeling. Its great disadvantage, that of the high tax of careful thinking that it demands, is offset by the great pleasure that careful thinking affords.

After *heissen*, *hören* (sometimes also *zuhören*), *lassen*, *schen*, and less commonly *fühlen* the infinitive in German usually has active form even where the meaning is passive: "Er liess den Arzt holen", *He had the doctor sent for*. We occasionally find the passive form instead of the active: "Und da sitztest du nun und siehst ihn von dem braven germanistischen Pinsel von Vater und der lächerlichen Hexe seiner Mutter immer mehr verzogen werden, (Raabe's, *Der Lar*, p. 158), *Now you quietly sit here and see him being ever more and more spoiled*, etc. Here the present passive infinitive emphasizes the progressive idea, i. e. represents somebody as *being* acted upon. Sometimes, on the other hand, the perfect passive participle is employed here to represent an act as a whole: "Alt, sich beim Vornamen gerufen hörend, hob schnell den Kopf" (Georg Wasner's *Der rote Faden*, II), *Alt, hearing himself called, raised*, etc. While these two ideas find in German only an occasional formal expression, they are regularly so distinguished in English. This tendency in German to give expression to the passive idea and even to different shades of this idea does not seem to have attracted the attention of grammarians. Otherwise some of them would now be earnestly trying to suppress it as they are con-

stitutionally opposed to progress of any kind. Where the need of development is the greatest, these men usually offer the most vigorous opposition. If this statement is not true they might easily make it manifest by fostering the passive forms in this construction, for the German is here evidently inferior to English and sometimes even completely ambiguous, as in: "Ich hörte ihn rufen", *I heard him calling*, or *heard him called* (by someone). The writer would be grateful for examples of the passive forms here. He has been able to find only a few himself and desires more ample materials for the study of this development.

Northwestern University.

GEORGE O. CURME.